

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 20, 22-36, and 38-40 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 20, 24, 27, and 36 are currently amended and new Claim 40 is added. Support for the present amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2, and in Claims 20 and 34. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 27 was objected to; Claims 24 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 20, 22, 23, 26, 29-33, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Sherts (U.S. Patent No. 2,359,163); Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sherts; Claims 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 35, 36, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Florentin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,965, hereinafter “Florentin”) in view of Ostrmislensky (U.S. Patent No. 2,189,293); Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sherts in view of Rowland (U.S. Patent No. 5,391,411); and Claims 24 and 34 were indicated as including allowable subject matter. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 24 and 34.

In response to the objection to Claim 27, the claim is hereby amended to correct the minor informality noted by the Office Action. Specifically, Claim 27 is amended to refer to outer surfaces of the first and second substrates. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claim 27 be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claim 24 is hereby amended to cure the issues noted in the Office Action. With respect to Claim 34, the claim language refers to the first substrate. In view of amended Claim 24, it is believed that

all pending claims are definite and no further rejections on that basis are anticipated.

However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections and traverses these rejections, as discussed below.

Amended Claim 20 recites, in part, “at least one support element positioned in the first substrate to fasten the laminated element to an infrastructure; and active position fastening of the second substrate to the first substrate, at least in the event of failure of the bonded joint.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 20.

Specifically, Sherts describes a double glazed closure unit 10 in which safety glass panels 14, 15 are spaced to form an air chamber 16 between them. Organic plastic is used as an interlayer material and glass plates 19 (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed first and second substrates) are bonded to opposite sides of the interlayer 17. However, Sherts does not disclose or suggest a “support element positioned in the first substrate,” as recited in Claim 20. In Sherts, fasteners 25 (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed support element) are positioned in holes of **frame elements 24** clamped upon extensions 20 of the interlayer 17 and thus, the fasteners 25 are not **positioned in** the first substrate 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 20, and all claims which depend thereon, as anticipated by Sherts be withdrawn.

Florentin describes a door assembly including glass sheets 2, 3 (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed first and second substrates) welded together by means

of an inorganic seal 6, which is not subject to creep at room temperature.¹ A pair of fastening elements 9 is positioned at the top and bottom of the door, respectively, to hinge the door to a frame. Fig. 3 of Florentin shows that the fastening element 9 includes a female element 10 (asserted in the Office Action as corresponding to the claimed support element) projecting from a top or bottom side of the fastening element 9. The female element 10 is not positioned in either of the glass sheets 2, 3. Thus, Florentin does not disclose or suggest “support element positioned in the first substrate,” as recited in amended Claim 20. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ostrmislensky does not cure the deficiencies of Florentin. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 20, and all claims which depend thereon, as unpatentable over Florentin in view of Ostrmislensky, be withdrawn.

Claim 27 depends on Claim 20, and thus is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 20. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Rowland does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Sherts. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 27 be allowed.

Independent Claim 36 recites, in part, “at least one support element positioned in the first substrate to fasten the laminated element to an infrastructure; and active position fastening of the second substrate to the first substrate, at least in the event of failure of the bonded joint.” Accordingly, in view of the above discussion with respect to Claim 20, it is respectfully submitted that these references do not disclose or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 36. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 36, and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

New Claim 40 is added by the present amendment. Support for new Claim 40 can be found in the original specification, for example, in Claims 20 and 34. Thus, it is respectfully

¹ See Florentin, at col. 8, lines 45-47.

submitted that no new matter is added. New Claim 40 includes the features of independent Claim 20 and the allowable subject matter from Claim 34. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that new Claim 40 be allowed.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Adnan H. Bohri
Registration No. 62,648